

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. 19880-003700 (SEDN/247CIP6)

Page 6 of 9

REMARKS

Applicants traverse all of the rejections in the Office Action and respectfully request reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance for the following reasons. Claims 23-37 are currently pending.

Claims 23, 28 and 33 have been amended to further clarify the present invention. Support for the amended claims can be found, for example, on page 42, line 31 to page 44, line 30, and no new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

Claims 23-37 are patentable over Coleman and Oishi under §103

Claims 23-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,844,620 to Coleman ("Coleman") in view of U.S. Patent 6,779,195 to Oishi ("Oishi").

Applicants have amended independent claims 23, 28 and 33 to further recite: "a roster comprising a plurality of roster elements, each roster element associated with a corresponding IPG page currently provided to the terminal, each roster element comprising a first field containing a packet identifier (PID) for the corresponding IPG page and one or more additional fields containing additional PIDs for respective regions of the IPG page". Claims 23, 28 and 33 also recite: "using the roster to determine the PIDs for the respective regions of the selected IPG page, processing these PIDs to recover the selected IPG page, and presenting the selected IPG page to the viewer, without requesting transmission of the selected IPG page from the headend." As set forth below, neither Coleman nor Oishi teaches or suggests at least these features of claims 23, 28 and 33.

Examiner relied on col. 13, line 49 to col. 14, line 22 of Coleman (program guide elements stored in RAM) as disclosing a roster. Applicants submit that Coleman does not teach or suggest Applicants' roster element with its various fields containing different PIDs, or using the roster to determine PIDs for the respective regions of the selected

501394-1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. 19880-003700 (SEDN/247CIP6)

Page 7 of 9

IPG page and processing the PIDs to recover the IPG page, as recited in claims 23, 28 and 33.

Specifically, Coleman discloses that different categories of data are carried in different packet streams each with a unique PID, and that each database page can have a unique PID (e.g., col. 4, lines 40-45). Coleman further teaches two different types of elementary PIDs making up the demand IPG download service - one carrying only records describing time slots, e.g., daily schedule/title records and description records, while the other carrying foundation data (col. 14, lines 52-62). Foundation data is used to control the processing of IPG functions, including those required to recover the transmitted information (col. 7, lines 29-34), and can be provided in a separate data stream having its own PID (col. 4, lines 45-48).

Although Coleman teaches that each time slot or page has a unique PID (e.g., col. 17, lines 9-13), and that each slot contains both schedule/title and description data blocks (e.g., col. 17, lines 42-64; Fig. 5), Coleman does not teach providing different PIDs for different data blocks within a page. That is, Coleman does not teach a roster element "comprising a first field containing a packet identifier (PID) for the corresponding IPG page and one or more additional fields containing additional PIDs for respective regions of the IPG page", as recited in claims 23, 28 and 33.

The Office Action further cited various sections of Oishi as utilizing a program map table (PMT) to identify audio, video and data PIDs associated with an IPG page (col.4, line 47-col. 5, line 22; col. 5, line 63-col. 6, line 9; col. 6, lines 21-33; and Fig. 4), and generating a program association table (PAT) to identify the PIDs for the PMT for the EPG pages via the Event information tables.

However, none of these cited sections of Oishi teaches or suggests a roster element having one or more fields containing PIDs for respective regions of an IPG page, or using the roster to determine PIDs for the respective regions of the selected IPG page and processing the PIDs to recover the IPG page, as recited in Applicants' claims 23, 28 and 33.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. 19880-003700 (SEDN/247CIP6)

Page 8 of 9

Thus, the combined teaching of Coleman and Oishi fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants' invention. As such, independent claims 23, 28 and 33 are not obvious over Coleman in view of Oishi, and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 24-27 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 23 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 23, while adding additional elements and further defining elements. Therefore, claims 24-27 are also patentable over the combination of Coleman and Oishi under §103 for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

Claims 29-32 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 28 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 28, while adding additional elements and further defining elements. Therefore, claims 29-32 are also patentable over the combination of Coleman and Oishi under §103 for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 28.

Claims 34-37 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 33 and, thus, inherit the patentable subject matter of claim 33, while adding additional elements and further defining elements. Therefore, claims 34-37 are also patentable over the combination of Coleman and Oishi under §103 for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 33.

PATENT


Atty. Dkt. No. 19880-003700 (SEDN/247CIP6)

Page 9 of 9

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance. If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/8/06

Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808